

THE Converted Catholic.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.—Luke xxii., 32.

Vol. V.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY, 1888.

No. 2

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Specially designed for the enlightenment of Roman Catholics and their conversion to Evangelical Christianity.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PUBLISHER,
60 Bible House, New York.

Subscription, Per Year, - - - - \$1.00
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Subscribers can have sample copies sent to friends by forwarding name and address.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as second-class mail matter.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC	34
A New Year's Greeting.....	35
REFORMED CATHOLIC WORK.....	36
"Why Call Yourself Father?"	39
Opposing Rome's Schemes.....	40
Father Hecker's Disappointments.....	41
Dough and the Wafer-god	41
New York's Papal Army.....	42
A Timely Protest.....	42
Typical Catholic Saints.....	43
The Church of Rome not the Church of Christ.	46
Our Country and our Duty.....	49
Jesuitism.....	52
Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal Gibbons	55
Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal Gibbons	58
Publisher's Notes.....	64

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THIS IS THE LAST MONTH THAT SUBSCRIBERS who have not renewed their subscriptions can expect to receive THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC. We hope they will not delay longer.

PRESIDENT SIMMONS OF THE NEW YORK City Board of Education, in his annual message last month said, that the American Flag should be displayed on the desk of every Principal of the Public Schools of the City; it would be an object lesson to the Children that would help to make them patriotic citizens. If he would also recommend that a copy of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC be placed in the hands of every Roman Catholic child in the Public Schools he would be a second Washington, for this little magazine aims at routing the universal enemy of civil and religious liberty—Popery, as Washington trained his guns on the foes of the Republic.

THE FOLLOWERS OF THE POPE IN THEIR weekly papers have dubbed Father McGlynn the modern Luther, on account of his brilliant address in the Academy of Music, the first part of which we publish this month.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.*From the St. Louis Presbyterian,*

December 23, 1887.

THIS is the title of a monthly magazine, published in New York City, and edited by Rev. James A. O'Connor, formerly a Roman Catholic priest.

Mr. O'Connor was led out of the thralldom of Rome into the liberty of Christ, and has for years been preaching the "glorious gospel of the blessed God" to Romanists, very many of whom he has been honored to bring to Christ. Adopting the wise plan not to identify himself and his converts with any of the existing denominations, he has the confidence and respect of all of them, for he clearly apprehends the truth as it is in Jesus, and preaches it (and nothing else) with simplicity and power and with the constantly manifested presence of the Holy Spirit.

Mr. O'Connor seeks to multiply his usefulness by the publication of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, which tells of his immediate work in New York, of that of other converted priests in other places, the experience of those who have renounced the Pope and come to Christ, the doings and designs of the priests in our own country, the corrupt doctrines and iniquitous deeds of the Romish Church, etc., etc.

In the heap of journals and magazines which come to us, there is nothing more admirably conducted, nothing more valuable in its bearing on the great work of saving souls, nothing that so stirs our souls for American liberty and our hatred of the Papacy, the unscrupulous enemy of our free institutions. We read each monthly number of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, from cover to cover, and always with admiration of the wisdom and Christian

pluck of "Father O'Connor," and a prayer for richest blessing on his work.

Would that we could persuade every one who reads these lines to send the small sum of one dollar for a year's trial of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*. He would not only find it exceedingly interesting, but learn many things that will make him open his eyes. He would see with surprise and gratification how even "Irish" Romanists, including priests, are breaking away from Popish slavery and becoming freeman in Christ; he would be convinced of the bold, desperate machinations of the Romish priests to control the opinion, the legislation, and the money of this country; and he would agree with Father O'Connor that the best and quickest way to thwart those machinations, is, not to trust the politicians, who for party's sake and official position are ready to barter their country's liberty to the priests for the Roman Catholic vote,—but to give the Gospel to these deluded people, to support missionaries among them who shall let them know that it is not the Church but Christ who saves.

We are under obligation to Mr. O'Connor for a bound volume containing the monthly numbers of his magazine for the present year, 1887. It is especially valuable for its detailed and very clear report of the conflict between Archbishop Corrigan and priest McGlynn, the excommunication of McGlynn, his speeches and the speeches of laymen who sympathize with him, and the enthusiasm of his congregation for their deposed pastor—a movement that has shaken the Romish Church, and the results of which may be of incalculable worth to civil liberty and evangelical religion.

A New Year's Greeting.

YPSILANTI, Mich., Jan. 1st, 1881.

DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR :

Your nice magazine comes with its regular monthly greeting, speaking to me not only of your peculiar work, but of yourself personally as well ; of your hopes and fears and encouragements and discouragements. When thinking of you sometimes, I seem to be able to just enter into your varied feelings and experiences, now cheered by sympathy, now hungering for lack of it, now rejoicing in successes and now saddened by disappointments. I realize that you must have passed through trials and troubles and difficulties, that there must have come times when the way seemed blocked up before you, times when in the home even, as well as in your public work, you hardly knew how "to make the ends meet." The struggle, I can well believe, has sometimes been a hard one, but you have borne it all with a brave, true, heroic spirit, trusting in the Lord and clinging to his promises with loving faith, working with your might to impart to others the light, which shining on your pathway, changed the whole current of your life and all its purposes. I thank God that in the years that have passed since then, your heart has yearned with a great yearning over your deluded countrymen vainly trusting to the intercession of saints and angles for salvation, that with untiring zeal you have pointed them to the "One Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." The Lord bless you, dear brother, in your efforts to sweep away the "refuge of lies," soul-destroying errors in which you have been reared, and bring them to Christ, the only hope of salvation.

It is the first day of a new year : like a spotless page it lies before us, but on that fair, unwritten page will be inscribed the record of our lives for the coming year—if those lives be spared—and that record we shall have to meet at the great day of accounts. May our hearts be impressed by this solemn thought, and may it incite us to renewed earnestness and diligence in the master's service. As the months come and go in their yearly round, may you rejoice in your work, as many through your efforts are led to Christ, and begin a new life.

On New Years day, I always like to send five dollars to help along some good cause, it is a good way to begin a new year, so I enclose that amount to you. But I wished to do something more, so I thought I would write you a letter expressive of my sympathy with you, and my appreciation of your faithful labors for others, and I asked the Lord to help me to say something that would cheer and comfort you, for I think there are hours when you do need cheer and comfort.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. G. W. L.

...

FOWLerville, N. Y., Jan. 11th, '88.

MY DEAR BROTHER :—Enclosed \$1 for THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for 1888.

I regard you as one of the greatest friends of our American institutions, by exposing the frauds of the most subtle foe Christ ever had in the shape of a church.

I have taken your Magazine from the beginning, and as long as you keep on the side of truth and holiness, you may depend upon me to take THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

G. R. HARVEY, Pastor M. E. Church

REFORMED ÷ CATHOLIC ÷ WORK.

SUNDAY, January 8, Father O'Connor preached on the "Papal Jubilee Sermons" delivered in New York the previous Sunday. He quoted from the sermon of Archbishop Corrigan in the Cathedral on Fifth Avenue in which he said, "Never have the Protestant sovereigns of the world been on such good terms with the Pope as at present, and they will yet find it necessary to reinstate him in his temporal power. They will know that he would then be able, as he has the right, to assist them in governing their kingdoms."

From the sermon of Monsignor Preston in St. Ann's Church, Father O'Connor quoted as follows: "Leo XIII., like Pius IX., is held a prisoner by the hostile bayonets of his ungrateful children, but he is stronger and more powerful to-day than ever before. The infallibility of the Pope is unquestioned. He cannot teach false doctrine. He cannot err. Every word Leo speaks from his high chair is the voice of the Holy Ghost, and must be obeyed. To every Catholic heart comes no thought but obedience.

"It is said that politics is not within the province of the Church, and that the Church has only jurisdiction in matters of faith. You say, 'I will receive my faith from the Pontiff, but I will not receive my politics from him.' This assertion is disloyal and untruthful. Of course it is not his business to tell you whom to vote for, but when a question arises which concerns society, it is the duty of the Pontiff to speak and it is the duty of the Catholics to obey.

"You must not think as you choose; you must think as Catholics. The man who says, 'I will take my faith from Peter, but I will not take my politics from Peter, is not a true Catholic. The Church teaches that the Supreme Pontiff must be obeyed, because he is the vicar of the Lord. Christ speaks through him.

"Leo XIII. is not only the prince or princes, but the king of kings. He is not only a spiritual ruler, but a temporal ruler. In tones as strong as those of Pius IX. Pope Leo has said, 'I will never yield; I will never give up my temporal principality.' And God, in his own time, will bring it back to him. Whether Leo XIII. receives his temporal principality soon or not we know that some day it will come back to him."

These extracts were taken from the report of the sermons in the New York *Herald* of January 2, which was headed "Faith and Politics; Monsignor Preston says Catholics must obey the Pope in both."

So much interest was manifested in the discourse that the preacher said he would speak again on the same subject the following Sunday, and he was happy to announce that the services would be held in Masonic Temple.

Sunday, the 15th, Father O'Connor preached again on the bold utterances of Monsignor Preston, that Catholics must not choose or think for themselves in political matters, and that every word that comes from the Pope is the voice of the Holy Ghost. After an exposition of the Scripture doctrine of the office of the Holy Ghost as the Third

Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Paraclete, the Comforter whom our Lord Jesus Christ said he would send to his disciples, he explained to the Roman Catholics present that all Christians believed in the Holy Ghost as the teaching power, as Jesus was the redeeming power of God. The Roman Church, however, claimed that there was a sort of partnership between the Holy Ghost and the Pope whereby the latter was made infallible. When the last deciding vote is cast at the conclave of Cardinals that elects a Pope, the Holy Ghost is supposed to descend upon him who is elected, and immediately he becomes personally infallible! So it was decreed at the Vatican Council in Rome in 1870. Pius IX. presided over the Council and of course ratified the decree that made him infallible. By the terms of that decree not only were Pius IX. and his successors to be infallible, but all their predecessors were likewise infallible.

Father O'Connor reviewed the history of some Popes who by the greatest stretch of charity could not be accounted decent men, much less holy or infallible men. Not to go back to remote periods of history, there was the Pope who was elected when Martin Luther was one year old. Innocent VIII. was elected Pope in 1484, and made it his first duty to provide for his sixteen children out of the Papal treasury. He gave them bishoprics and principalities, duchies, and counties, and went to war with King Ferdinand of Naples because the latter resisted the attempt of the Pope to seize on a part of his kingdom for some of the Papal children. Those sixteen children had many mothers, and of course were not the fruit of lawful wed-

lock, but of unholy lust. The corruption of morals during the reign of that Pope and for more than two hundred years previously under the government of other "infallible" Popes was something awful, but the climax was reached in the reign of Alexander VI. Only bare mention could be made of this infamous scoundrel and of his children, Cæsar and Lucretia Borgia. History tells us what their crimes were—certainly not the works of the Holy Ghost, but of Satan, as even the most bigoted Roman Catholic writers admit. It was a monstrous falsehood that any man who ever occupied the Papal chair was infallible, or the vicar of Christ. It is impossible to believe that God should use such men as "the voice of the Holy Ghost." Rather was the utterance of too many Popes the voice of Satan that had led their followers to destruction. The voice of God called upon the people who believed in the Pope to come out of his church "Come out of her, my people,"—and all who desired to be saved should do so.

There were many Catholics at the service, as this was the first meeting held this year in Masonic Temple. Two monks came to speak to Father O'Connor at the close of the service and each made an appointment to meet him in his office in the Bible House during the week. Not a service is held but some Catholics come to speak to him, to tell of some helpful word in the discourse delivered, to ask questions, to know more of the (to them) new way of salvation, or to relate some act of cruelty by a priest or bishop. Not long since the assistant sexton of the Jesuit Church on Sixteenth street came to him for aid to

prosecute the Jesuits for defrauding him of his salary. He was asked whether he still believed in the doctrines of such "holy fathers," and when he answered yes, he was told to go to Archbishop Corrigan or write to the Pope. They were the only persons who could punish the Jesuits for wrong-doing.

The Sunday before Christmas a young man, a graduate of the Jesuit College, attended the service and when introduced by his annt, who has long been one of the regular attendants at the Reformed Catholic services, said he was employed as bookkeeper in a wholesale liquor house where many of the priests of the city obtained their supplies. He mentioned the names of the priests and the churches of which they were pastors. One pastor who has only five assistants orders six gallons of whiskey, besides wine, every week, and the young man added that it was very good whiskey, or it would have killed the priests long ago. Priests' housekeepers also sometimes attend the meetings and tell queer stories of the "goings on" in some of the pastoral residences. To each and every Catholic who comes to him Father O'Connor tells of Jesus and his love and the way to him.

Sunday, January 22, Father O'Connor again preached on some other Popes who had disgraced mankind, and yet who, according to Monsignor Preston and Archbishop Corrigan, were "infallible," and whose utterances were the voice of the Holy Ghost. If Leo XIII. is infallible, Boniface VIII. was also infallible when he declared that the Pope could decree what he pleased and the Christian world should obey him. All men must obey his

commands whatever they be, yet he owes obedience to no one—not even to God. Almighty, said the preacher. He quoted the decrees of other Popes in which the most abject slavery was inculcated upon the people as the highest virtue. Roman Catholics who believe in the Pope's infallibility are slaves; they cannot be free men or good citizens until they renounce Popery forever.

There was a large congregation present, and it was evident that all were pleased at being back again in Masonic Temple. As the expenses are increased, however, they were invited to contribute more generously, but it is to be feared they did not heed the invitation. Funds were needed to defray the necessary expenses of the meetings, and it was hoped all would help.

Pastor Dekins' New Field.

The Long Island *Traveller*, January 13, 1888, had a most favorable notice of Brother Dekins' acceptance of the call to the pastorate of the Congregational Church, Greenport, N. Y., saying among other things: "The Rev. Stephen Dekins, the new pastor of the Greenport Congregational Church, is an eloquent preacher, and is already quite popular with the people. The congregations are steadily increasing, and much interest is shown in church work."

We hope the members of the church will invite their Roman Catholic neighbors to hear Pastor Dekins, as he has been a Roman Catholic himself, and loves to preach the truth to them now as he had been doing for so many years while engaged in the Reformed Catholic work.

"Why Call Yourself Father?"

In the letter from the Rev. Dr. John Hall, of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, from which an extract is given in the "Letters to Cardinal Gibbons," he says: "Having been for many years in close contact with Roman Catholic people, and in some degree in controversy, may I be forgiven if I give you a bit of my experience? It is easy to fight earnestly and exercise the intellect, and yet lose one's own spiritual heart-fervor which can only be retained by *personal*, non-controversial feeding on the word.

"While writing there is much I would like to say—but—I hardly know if I address my letter aright—to Father O'Connor, but I do not know any other way. I pray God to guide you into the best ways of working, living, and perpetuating good influences.

"Yours most truly,

"J. HALL."

It should be explained that the letter was addressed to "Father O'Connor, 60 Bible House, New York," as are many other letters received.

When the title "Father" was first conferred on Roman Catholic priests we know not, but it has been the custom for so long a time that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. After we had left the Roman Church our heart's desire was to forget and make the world forget that we ever had been a priest of Rome. In the study of medicine and in work in a physician's office in Cincinnati, the change of occupation was marked enough, but in personal appearance and garb we were still a priest. Meeting Catholic workmen while attending to business they would doff their hats with a cheery

"Good morning, Father," that made us almost scowl at them. We did not like the word nor anything else that reminded us of the priestly life. But how to get over the difficulty, was the question. It would not do to run up to the kind-hearted Irishmen and say we were no longer a priest. That would change their salutation to a curse. A story is told of an Irish "half-gentleman" whose gentility was offended by the inscription on his father's tomb—"*Pray for the soul of Paddy O'Rafferty.*" He told a stone-cutter to do away with the vulgar inscription, which the latter proceeded to do in his own way. The feelings of the gentleman can be better imagined than described when he saw the result of the stone-cutter's work—"Don't *pray for the soul of Paddy O'Rafferty.*"

The courteous salutations of our Roman Catholic friends might be turned to something equally caustic if we told them in the public streets that we had renounced the priesthood, the Pope and the whole Court of Rome.

But something must be done to stop their bowings and courtseys, and the most effectual remedy to check the nuisance was to let our beard grow. This we did, and nature's hirsute adornment has since continued with us, until now, thank God, no one would mistake us for a subject of the Pope of Rome.

When the divine call to preach the Gospel to the Catholics came to us and we entered upon this work in New York, it was represented to us that the old Roman appellation of "Father" would have the effect of drawing them to hear us, and we consented to use it for that purpose. And when we began the publication of THE CONVERTED

CATHOLIC the same reason induced us to place the words "Edited by Father O'Connor" as a sort of trade-mark on the title page. When the difficulty of reaching the Catholics with the Gospel is considered, and how unapproachable they are, it is wise to use such means as will best secure the end sought. There is no doubt whatever but Catholics have been drawn to our services by seeing the announcement that "Father So and so" would preach, and it is equally certain that hundreds of them have read THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC because they saw the same title at the head of the editorial page. Personally we care absolutely nothing for such a title. It has no meaning for us (except when we are so addressed by our children) and we would not allow it to stand before our name for a moment except to draw the attention of our Roman Catholic brethren to the "Good Tidings" that we have for them in speech and writing.

...
OPPOSING ROME'S SCHEMES.

The Protestants of Philadelphia are to be congratulated that they have such a paper as the *Presbyterian Journal* to oppose and expose the schemes of the Jesuits in that city. Last year it denounced at length and in most vigorous language the attempt to aggrandize Cardinal Gibbons at the Constitutional Centennial, where he was invited to offer the closing prayer. He marched to the platform in his scarlet robes with a procession of prelates at his heels, escorted by General Phil Sheridan, the Lieutenant-General of the United States Army.

The *Presbyterian Journal* published column upon column of animadversion

on the action of the committee that invited Gibbons, and for several weeks kept up the fusillade against the powers of darkness and the powers of Rome (synonymous terms). That it had not overestimated the importance of the demonstration by Gibbons & Co. is apparent from the impression produced by the event at Rome. The Roman correspondent of an English paper, the Liverpool *Catholic Times*, says in its issue of Dec. 23, 1887:

There are no more loyal or enthusiastic Catholics in the world than the Americans. The head of the States has always paid due attention to their wishes. President Cleveland, interpreting their universal desire with regard to the Papal Jubilee, has offered his felicitations to Leo XIII. through his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, who, it will be remembered, took with President Cleveland the leading part in the recent Centennial celebration at Philadelphia. The Pope has been greatly pleased with this evidence of good will on behalf of the representatives of a great nation. He has further learned that President Cleveland is sending a Jubilee gift with an autograph letter.

President Cleveland did send his gift to the Pope, a copy of the Constitution of the United States (wrapped, let us hope, in the American Flag), and his action has been severley criticised in many quarters. The leading organs of the Methodist Church have censured him, and a Methodist minister in Baltimore, Rev. Dr. Clemm, introduced a condemnatory resolution in the Baltimore Preachers' Meeting, January 9. However, if President Cleveland must send a gift to the Pope to offset Mr. Blaine's standing bid for the "Roman Catholic vote," his good taste must be commended, for the Pope and his followers ought to know the Constitution, if for no other reason than that the American people will crush them if they dare to violate it.

Father Hecker's Disappointments.

FROM "Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography," Vol. III., just published, we learn that during Father Hecker's connection with the Brook Farm experiment in communism the duty assigned him was to bake the community bread. This was according to the fitness of things as his relatives were engaged in the flour business. Either the flour was below grade or his baking was bad, for he stayed at Brook Farm only nine months. On leaving he was accompanied by Thoreau, and both set out to make experiments to show how little was necessary to sustain life. They found that nine cents a day supplied their actual necessities. The barrenness of transcendentalism and his failure to find God in Nature induced young Hecker to give up his reason altogether and enter the Roman Catholic Church. He became a member of the Redemptorist order, but their rule did not quite suit him, and as he could not change it he organized an order of his own—the Paulists. He has been the superior of that order, or more properly, congregation, since its foundation, more than thirty years ago. It was expected that many perverts to Rome would join him, but not more than a dozen have been gathered in during all those years. Some of them are more or less distinguished, as, Father Deshon, who was a classmate of General Grant's at West Point, and Father Hewitt, whose father was an honored Congregational minister in Connecticut. Though Father Hecker has built a fine church at the corner of Ninth avenue and Fifty-ninth street,

which he hoped would be the center of "American influences" in Roman Catholic circles in this city, as if by the irony of fate his congregation is as distinctively Irish as is the parish of St. James in the Fourth Ward. Father Hecker has learned the lesson that Americans will not become Romanists, and if he lives some years longer he will learn another lesson—that even the Irish when they become imbued with American ideas will fall away from the Church of Rome.

Dough and the Wafer-god.

ONE of the charges brought against Father McGlynn by Monsignor Preston, was that McGlynn allowed a working-woman to approach the altar rail and receive the communion while she carried a bundle in her hand. What would the Monsignor do in the case of the "saint" referred to in the sermon delivered on New Year's Day by one of the Paulist Fathers in their church on Fifty-ninth street and reported in the *Catholic Review*, January 7, 1888. The preacher said: "I think it was one of the St. Catherine's who was kneading dough to make bread for the community when the bell rang for communion; she went up and received our Lord with the dough sticking to her hands, and then went back to her batch of bread." Preston taunted McGlynn with irreverence for the "holy communion" because he did not order the poor woman to lay down her bundle; but why did not "St. Catherine" remove the dough by washing her hands? It would take only two minutes to do so. What an absurdity is the whole Roman system of religion—in small things as in

great. The working woman and the "saint" were led to believe they were receiving the body and blood, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ in the communion, but they only received some dried dough like that which besmeared the "saint's fingers."

New York's Papal Army.

IN Rev. Joseph Hartwell's remarkable pamphlet, "Romanism and Politics; Tammany Hall the Stronghold of Rome," the annual expenses of the city government of New York, taken from the official records, amounted to \$34,000,000. It was shown that this was the average for several years, but it was predicted that with a united Democratic party in power, Tammany Hall, to provide places for its henchmen, would find some means of increasing the appropriations. This prediction has now been verified. At the election last fall the Democratic party of New York city became united for the first time in many years, with Tammany Hall in the ascendant, and the city "expenses," which were \$34,343,022, in 1887, have been increased to \$37,051,053, for the year 1888. The most notable increase was in the department of "Charities and Correction." The appropriation of that department in 1887 was \$1,493,300, while in 1888 it amounts to \$2,343,372.

As a large majority of those for whom the City must provide are Roman Catholics, and as an equally large majority of the employees in all departments of the city government belong to the same Church, it can be seen at a glance what a formidable Papal army the citizens of New York have to support.

A Timely Protest.

THE Rev. Carlos Martyn, at the Bloomingdale Reformed Church, last evening preached from the text, "So that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," his subject being, "Father Preston and Dr. McGlynn on Papal Infallibility." After quoting from the New Year's sermon of Vicar-General Preston, in which the latter claimed the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff in political as well as religious matters, and from Dr. McGlynn's answer at the Academy of Music a week ago, at which the Doctor asked, "What has the Pope to do with politics, or politics to do with the Pope?" He continued as follows:

"Dr. McGlynn is an able man, and any student of history must acknowledge that he is right in his answer to Father Preston. The doctrine of an infallible Pope is the most monstrous of fallacies. All history gives that dogma the lie. What does the statement of Monsignor Preston in reality mean? It means that the Pope is President, and not Grover Cleveland, if we must look to Rome for guidance in political matters. It is a serious point, because on many subjects American ideas and those of the Pope are seriously at odds. In matters relating to education, marriage, secret societies and almost everything they are at odds. The Pope represents an alien civilization. This is the age of reason, when free thought sits on the throne, not the Pope. I love to recall the words of Rufus Choate, when he says: 'There is in this country a Church without a Bishop, and a State without a King. God save the Church from the one and the State from the other.'

TYPICAL CATHOLIC SAINTS.

BY LEO REED.

VIII.

DOES any one doubt that truth is stranger than fiction? If so let him read Father Chiniquy's wonderful book, "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome." Like Dante, led through the Inferno by the shade of Virgil, so the amazed reader follows Father Chiniquy through the hideous scenes presented by Romanism.

In his vivid manner Father Chiniquy relates his experience in a monastery, of which he was for some time an inmate and dwells upon the vow of obedience as understood and enforced by the Church. Now, as some may consider the utterances of an "apostate priest" biased, let us see what Alphonsus M. Liguori, the saint and "Doctor of the Church," has to say on the same subject.

In section II. Chapter VII. of "The True Spouse of Christ," the saint writes: "Obedience to rule and to the commands of superiors is the greatest sacrifice a Christian can offer to God. . . . 'For,' says the Holy Ghost, 'Obedience is better than sacrifices.'—1 Kings xv: 22. . . . Yes, says St. Gregory, the obedient shall overcome all the temptations of hell; because by obedience they subject their will to men. . . . God promises those who renounce their own will that he will raise them above the earth, and give them a celestial spirit. 'If,' says the Lord, 'thou turn away from doing thy own will, . . . I will lift thee up above the high places of the earth, and will feed thee with the

inheritance of Jacob.'—Isaiah LVIII: 12."

The Saint has blundered in his reference, as the above quotation is from verses 13, 14 of the chapter indicated, and to show his deliberate dishonesty in applying the passage to obedience due the superior of a monastery, it is only necessary to give in full the verses mentioned from the Douay Bible:

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy own will in my holy day, and call the Sabbath delightful, and the holy of the Lord glorious, and glorify him, while thou dost not thy own ways, and thy own will is not found to speak a word:

Then shalt thou be delighted in the Lord; and I will lift thee up above the high places of the earth, and will feed thee with the inheritance of Jacob thy father. For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

On page 93 of his precious book Liguori goes on: "Obedience shown to superiors is shown to God; for he has said: 'He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.' Bear then, always in mind, O, blessed sister, that the obedience, which you practice towards your superiors is paid to God himself. . . . Hence blessed Egidius used to say that it is more meritorious to obey man for the love of God than to obey God himself. It may be added, that there is more certainty of doing the will of God by obedience to superiors than by obedience to Jesus Christ, should he

appear in person and give his commands. Because, should Jesus Christ appear to a religious, she would not be certain whether it was he that spoke or an evil spirit, who, under the appearance of the Redeemer, wished to deceive her. But when her superiors speak, she knows for certain, from the words of Jesus Christ, that in obeying them she obeys him. . . . Thus, on the day of judgment, religious will be charged with every act of disobedience: but, as St. Phillip Neri used to say, they shall be most certain of not having to render an account of the actions performed through obedience. For these the superiors only who commanded them shall be held accountable. Speaking particularly of nuns, the Lord once said to St. Catharine of Sienna: 'Religious will not be obliged to render an account to me of what they do through obedience; for that I will demand an account from the superiors.' . . . If, (Page 95), then, blessed sister, you wish to be truly obedient and truly religious, bear continually in mind that your superiors hold in your regard the place of Jesus Christ: " . . .

In Section IV. "On the obedience due to the rules," the Saint tells his readers: "In a word, the only way by which a religious can become a saint and be saved is to observe her rule: for there is no other way that leads to salvation." On page 101 follows the astonishing declaration that "All the rules of religion should be respected, because they are all ordained by Almighty God, and approved by the Church."

The Italian claims that the rules of the cloister are so many decrees of the Almighty, and adds, by way of a clincher, that they are "approved by

the Church." Of course that places the matter beyond argument. We may, however, pause to admire the condescension of Holy Mother Church in graciously bestowing her approval upon the decrees of the Creator.

On the next page it is said that "Tepid and negligent religious disregard trifles, but the devil sets great value on the smallest violation of rule: he carefully marks all our transactions, to charge us one day before the tribunal of Jesus Christ. St. Richard, a religious, having once got his hair cut before the usual time, saw the devil gathering and numbering the hairs that were scattered over the floor. In like manner, St. Gertrude saw the enemy collecting all the little tufts of wool which, for want of the perfect spirit of poverty, she had allowed to be wasted; and all the syllables of the office that had been omitted in consequence of its being recited with too much tepidity. Blessed Denis, the Carthusian, relates that Satan appeared once to a religious with a needle and a silk thread in his hand, which she had used without permission."

Section V. treats of "the four degrees of perfect obedience." "To be perfect in obedience, a religious must obey with promptness, exactness, cheerfulness and simplicity. . . . Oh! how meritorious in the sight of God is prompt obedience. He has several times shown, even by supernatural prodigies, how acceptable it is in His sight. St. Mark, a monk, while engaged in writing, was called by his superior, the Abbot Silvan; the saint left unfinished a word which he had just commenced, and instantly obeyed. On his return he found the remainder of the word written in letters of gold. Blossius relates that a nun to whom the

Infant Jesus appeared, being summoned at the moment of his appearance to a certain duty, instantly obeyed the call. At her return she found him grown up to the age of manhood, and was addressed by him in the following words: 'My child, your ready obedience has made me grow thus in your heart.' Jesus appeared to another religious, who on hearing the bell for vespers left him, and went to the choir. When she returned to her cell, He appeared to her again and said: 'Because you left me, you have found me again; had you not obeyed the call of duty I should have departed from you.' . . . Blessed Juniper, while employed in planting a tree in the garden, was called by St. Francis. The brother did not obey the call immediately, but waited till he had finished the work in which he was engaged. The saint to show him the fault he had committed by the tardiness of his obedience, cursed the tree, and, on the part of God, commanded it to grow no larger. The tree obeyed and never increased in size."

In order to reach the fourth and last degree of this wonderful virtue the religious must "obey with simplicity." An innocent-looking phrase, to be sure, but to understand just what it means let us look over a few choice sentences taken from pages 117-121 of "The True Spouse of Christ."

"To be simple of heart you must subject your own judgment to that of the superior, and esteem as just and reasonable whatever she commands. . . . St. Thomas teaches that, though the commands of a superior may appear impossible, a religious should make an effort to fulfil them. . . .

n subjects perfect obedience does not

require discretion. . . . This doctrine is conformable to sacred scripture: 'Behold,' says the Lord, 'as clay is in the potter's hands, so are you in my hands, O house of Israel!'—Jer. xviii. 6. Religious must leave themselves in the hands of the superior to be moulded as she wills. 'Shall the clay say to him that fashioned it: What art thou making?'—Is. xlv: 9. . . . To regard as good whatever superiors command is the blind obedience so much praised by the saints, and is the duty of every religious. . . .

"To try the obedience of their subjects superiors sometimes impose commands that are inexpedient, and even absurd. St. Francis commanded his disciples to plant cabbages with their roots uppermost. He obliged brother Matthew to continue turning round till he fell to the ground. St. Teresa made similar trials of her children. But you ask of what use are such precepts. In answer, I ask why are untrained horses made sometimes to run, sometimes to stop, and sometimes to go back? All these contribute to make them obedient to the bridle: and to exercise religious in what appears extravagant and useless, accustoms them to subdue the stubbornness of their own will, and to subject their own judgments to that of their superior."

The foregoing is the precise language of a "Saint." As the dumb brute is trained to be "obedient to the bridle," so, in the same manner, and for the same purpose, is the manhood or the womanhood of every religious subjugated and crushed. And the small-souled Italian monk, the teacher, of such damnable doctrines, is exalted to the rank of "Saint" and "Doctor of the Church!"

PITTSBURGH, Jan. 13, 1888.

 THE CHURCH OF ROME NOT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

 BY PAUL LE CLAIR.

 II.

Is the Constitutional Law of the Christian Church the same as that which governs the Church of Rome?

BY THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, we mean, as already stated (No. 1. 2.) the body which is composed of all those in every nation, together with their children, who profess the Holy Religion of Christ, and submission to his Laws, as taught only in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

2. And by THE CHURCH OF ROME, we mean the body which is composed of all those in every nation, who acknowledge and adhere to the supreme and infallible jurisdiction of the Pope or Bishop of Rome, as the head of that communion. That these two bodies exist, will not be denied. That they are diverse from each other, is also, beyond question. The points of their diversity are numerous and essential. That to be considered first, is the particular authority for their separate existence, and in virtue of which, each respectively claims, to the exclusion of the other, to be the only TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

3. As God only has perfect knowledge of the human heart, and in his omniscience, has, at all times, every thought and emotion open and naked before him (Heb. 4 : 13), he only can know with perfect certainty, what we believe and what we reject. For this reason, it is beyond all question, evident, that God only is competent to teach man what he should believe, and how he should order his life. It is

utterly in vain for our fellow man, unauthorized by God, to attempt to impose upon our conscience, subjects of faith, commanding us to believe as he bids us. We may, indeed, fearing his power to rob, or oppress, or destroy us, *pretend* to believe his dogmas, and so declare our *professed* faith ; but he can never know whether we believe them or not, nor verify the truth of our professions. For he cannot read our conscience or penetrate the recesses of our heart. This power is the peculiar and exclusive attribute of the Infinite Being who made us ; and to him alone, it pertains to bind the human conscience in absolute faith.

4. In like manner, none beside the Almighty and Infinitely Glorious God, has the right to prescribe the rule of our obedience. By him we exist, and from him we receive all things. To him, therefore, are we under absolute and eternal obligation ; and his Will alone, is the binding law of our life. No other laws must contravene his ; and all other obedience must be in subordination to that which is due to God our Maker and Judge (Acts 5 : 29).

5. And not only is God the only Being that has the right to command our faith and obedience, and that possesses the ability to know and judge whether or not, we obey from the heart, the law which he ordains for us ; but he alone is possessed of sufficient power, adequately to punish unpar-

doned violations of his law. If in our religion, we disbelieve and disobey men, they can but kill the body. With its deprivation of life, their ability to persecute is exhausted. But if we disbelieve and disobey God, his omnipotent hand can follow us beyond the confines of time, and through all eternity. And hence, our Saviour, in preparing his followers for the hour of trial and persecution, supplied them with an all sufficient reason for obeying God rather than man, when he said: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." [GEHENNA] Matt. 10 : 28.*

6. By the Church of Christ the Will of God for the instruction and salvation of men is believed to be contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments—forming together the book commonly called THE BIBLE.

7. This BIBLE, the Church of Christ accepts with unquestioning faith, and receives with profound reverence, as given by inspiration of God. For it was written "by holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," (2 Peter, 1 : 21). This we know with perfect certainty; for no men could do the miracles which were wrought by the Prophets and Apostles, unless God were with them (John 3 : 2).

This Bible, therefore, is held by Christians, to be alone, amply and fully sufficient as the guide book to eternal life; it is able both to make even a child "wise unto salvation;" and "the man of God," or a mature Christian, "thoroughly furnished unto

all good works,"—that is, to reach all attainable perfection in the divine life (2 Tim. 3 : 15-17). Accordingly, the sacred Scriptures recognize nothing beyond the record contained on their own pages, as the law of the human conscience in the Church of Christ. And hence this Church receives nothing as the rule of her faith and obedience that is not expressly stated in those Scriptures, or that may not, by fair inference, be deduced from them. It has, therefore, been truly said that "In the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants."

8. Now let us inquire—What constitutes the fundamental law of the Church of Rome? By what rule does she regulate the faith and conduct of her members? To what standard does she appeal to justify her system in its essential contrariety to the Gospel of Jesus Christ?

These, and similar important questions relative to the Papal doctrines, may be answered from the Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Catechism of the same Council, the Creed of Pope Pius IV. and from any other publications authorized by the Pope or any of the Papal Bishops. According to a Decree of Trent, "the Word of God," which is the rule of their faith and practice, "consists of two parts: the written Word, called Holy Scripture, and the unwritten Word, called Divine Tradition." Decree de Can. Script.

9. Here, then, at the outset, we have an essential distinction between the two ecclesiastical bodies we are comparing: the Church of Christ restricted to a specific, definite, all-suffi-

* From the principles stated, it follows that as God alone is the Lord of the conscience, the Church itself is not armed with the authority to visit alleged unbelief or heresy, with civil pains and penalties. The utmost lawful discipline to be exercised is exclusion or excommunication.

cient, and unalterable WRITTEN CODE ; while the Church of Rome has her INSUFFICIENT WRITTEN CODE, supplemented by a system of law-making, cunningly devised to meet any emergency of time or circumstance, and which they style " DIVINE TRADITION." While the Church of Rome, therefore, receives her unwritten traditions as of equal authority with her written scriptures ; the Church of Christ, receiving only THE HOLY SCRIPTURES as the all-sufficient law of faith and practice, given by inspiration of God, rejects all unwritten traditions as wholly destitute of divine authority ; and therefore, forming no part of the Word of God. This is certainly a very important difference.

10. In adopting " Tradition " as a part of her rule of faith and practice, the Papal society has committed the same grave error that the Jews were guilty of, in following with religious veneration, the traditions of their elders ; and like that superstitious and deluded people, they have, " by their traditions, made the Word of God of none effect." To enjoin anything as of divine obligation on the authority of tradition, when God's written Word is either silent on the subject, or teaches a contrary doctrine, is a principle fatal to the sovereign authority of that Word. And it is against this destructive principle that the Saviour upon a certain occasion (Matt. 15 : 1-6) directs his severe and merited animadversion.

The Scribes and Pharisees had demanded " Why his disciples transgressed the traditions of the elders in not washing their hands before they ate bread ? " The Lord, in reply, made no immediate remark upon this particular point ; but at once exposed the true nature, the pernicious tendency of

their *tradition principle*, in its leading them upon another point, into a direct and flagrant transgression of a positive command of God's written Word (the fifth commandment). And the principle is equally pernicious, whether adopted by Jews or Romanists. Its essential tendency is to nullify the written Word of God, and to overwhelm each successive generation with accumulating errors and corruptions ; and its sole available utility is to hold its miserable adherents in abject bondage at the feet of unscrupulous, God-defying, priestly despotism.

11. The blessed Saviour having so emphatically condemned the principle of " Unwritten Traditions," as subversive of the definite, absolute and supreme authority of the written Word of God, his Church cannot be persuaded that he would have left any part of his revealed will, essential to her edification *unwritten by the spirit of inspiration*, and in the verbal custody of corrupt and fallible men ; especially as he has most expressly and emphatically declared in his written Word the completeness and sufficiency of that Word for the instruction and salvation of lost men (Psalms 19 : 7-14 ; Rev. 22 : 18, 19).

12. Under these circumstances the Church of Christ must needs be satisfied with the written law of her adorable Head and King, while she is constrained to regard unwritten traditions even if they were of undoubted divine origin, as *non-essential to saving faith and life*. But when those traditions are of known human origin such as are all the traditions of Romanism, she utterly rejects them as subversive of the sovereign authority of her one, only, all-competent, Law-giver and Judge !

OUR COUNTRY AND OUR DUTY.

BY REV. NEWTON WRAY, PASTOR M. E. CHURCH, BEDFORD, N. Y.

II.

CONSIDER some of the evils before whose insidious, if not defiant encroachments we have been supinely waiting too long.

Sabbath Desecration.—The Almighty is jealous of his holy day. He threatened his judgments upon Israel for its violation, and the terrible punishments which fell upon that ancient people were in large part the result of this sin. If a nation will not keep his law he will scatter it among enemies, and "then shall the land rest and enjoy her Sabbaths." A reference to Isaiah 58: 13, 14, shows that prosperity is conditioned upon a proper regard for the Sabbath. When was the fourth commandment abolished? Who wants it abolished? The godless agencies that threaten to overwhelm in wild dissipation and ruin this feature of American Christianity come to our shores reeking with the slime of European infidelity and vice. At a German infidel political meeting held in Cincinnati on Sunday, some time ago, one of the speakers was reported to say: "One would make an American a poor standard if he compared him to a Puritan. Puritanism is at the bottom of it all, and it must be fought to the bitter end. This is the fight of the Germans now. It is not the fight of a day but of years, and he hoped none would be so stupid as to keep his eyes closed to the fact." The speaker went on to classify as Puritanism all the Churches, Theological Seminaries, Young Men's Christian Associations, Temperance Unions, and "the fanatical women who persist that

the fall of Puritanism would lower morality." He hoped that the Germans would organize and fight to the bitter end for a *free Sabbath*.

This is a sample of the men who talk contemptuously of our Puritan forefathers, who would rather have died than had their names linked with such detestable Sunday principles. Let us hear what some of the real descendants of these God-fearing Puritans say. "Our Puritan ancestors," says James Russel Lowell, "have been misrepresented and maligned by persons without imagination enough to make themselves contemporary with, and therefore unable to understand the men whose memories they strive to blacken. That happy breed of men, who both in Church and State led our first emigration, were the children of the most splendid intellectual epoch that England has ever known. They were the coevals of a generation which passed on in scarcely diminished radiance the torch of life kindled in great Eliza's golden days." Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, replying to the question whether the strictness of the Puritan Sabbath did not excite a distaste for it and for religion, said emphatically, that it did not. "The effect of the system," she says, "was to ingrain into our character a veneration for the Sabbath which no friction of after life would ever efface. I have lived to wander in many climates and foreign lands where the Sabbath is an unknown name, or where it is only recognized by noisy mirth; but never has the day returned without

bringing with it a breathing of religious awe, and even a yearning for the unbroken stillness and the simple devotion of the Puritan Sabbath."

"Puritanism," says Dr. John R. Paxton, "quickeneth life, reneweth conscience, truth, duty and God. It died for human rights, justice, freedom and truth. If a State is to be founded, a society organized, a battle fought against Xerxes or the devil, then we want a Puritan, a man of iron and blood, who has abandoned the flesh, whose soul has no room in it except for the idea of God and conscience, who is strong in duty, who enthrones worship on the domestic hearth, truth before the tribunals, honesty in the counting-house, labor in the work shop, and puts conscience into everything he does. We cannot get on long in this world without him. Without an occasional uprising of the Puritan to set things right, society would not hold together, but would rot in incurable selfishness and sensuality, and fall to pieces."

These are the words of truth and soberness. When we want a just conception of Puritan character, we will not inquire of men who antagonize with unrelenting hatred the principles for which the Puritan fought and died.

The Sabbath is a distinctive feature of American life and religion. The conscience of the people from the beginning has been entwined about it. To weaken that conscience and tear away the Sabbath would loosen the very fibres of our national life. If we expect the continuance of Almighty God's blessing, and hope to accomplish our mission as the guardians of Christian civilization, we must stand for the law of God, and combat that growing spirit

of irreverence which looks with indifference, if not approval, on its practical nullification.

Socialism, as advocated by certain classes, is another menace to our institutions. There is one kind of socialism that deserves success. No one will deny that there are evils in our political and social system. Concerted action to redress these is always in order. Therefore, labor organizations and other lawful means for the attainment of worthy ends, are to be encouraged. But that dark spirit of political and social destructionism which finds its weapons in the knife and the bomb is of hell, and means ruin without remedy. It is to be put down by the strong arm of law wherever it raises its black head. Things will right themselves, if we hold fast to the principles of Christianity and seek to enforce them.

The Liquor Power.—This is the inspiration of a large portion of the evils that affect the country. Consider how intimate is the connection between it and Sabbath desecration. The mis-called *Personal Liberty Party* recently set on foot in the State of New York, has its origin in the rum traffic and rum drinking, and is a systematic attempt on the part of liquor dealers and their allies to destroy our Sabbath and foist upon us the ungodly customs of Europe. If American people do not call a halt to this kind of work, we shall be Continentalized.

Again, there would be less ground for socialism, so-called, if men were freed from intemperance. They would have more bread and less misery. Think of a socialistic picnic, at which the chief feature is hundreds of dollars worth of liquor, and the parade to

which is signalized by banners inscribed with such miserable sentiments as these: "We want bread; "Our children are starving," etc. Such people need only the command of the living God: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doing from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well. . . If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it." Let men be temperate and obey God, and they will have many a dollar to spend for comfort that now goes for sin and wretchedness.

But our duty is none the less strong to fight a traffic that blinds so many to their own good, and threatens our national life. Who that loves his country is not alarmed at the aggressions of this diabolical agency against the purity of the ballot-box and the most sacred rights of the people? Its selfish demands have become insufferable, while its power in manipulating our political machinery is such as to cause every true citizen to swear uncompromising hostility to it. Let the watchword be, death to the monster! and let the effort be unremitting till it be slain.

One other iniquity remains to be mentioned—Romanism. The machinations of this unscrupulous power have been too long winked at by the American people. With all its pretended sympathy for American institutions, it is still the same inveterate foe of free thought and conscience. Hear what the *Western Watchman*, a Roman Catholic paper published at St. Louis, says: "Protestantism; we would DRAW and QUARTER it. We would EMPALE and HANG it up for crow's meat. We

would TEAR IT WITH PINCERS and FIRE IT WITH MOLTEN LEAD and sink it in a HUNDRED FATHOMS OF HELL FIRE." Some doubts having been expressed as to the accuracy of this startling announcement, a gentleman wrote to the editor, requesting information. The editor returned the extract as above, with the added sentence, "But would not lay an ungentle hand on a hair in a Protestant's head."

But in view of the well-known history and spirit of that system, such a qualification amounts to nothing. You cannot separate a man from his conscience. To destroy Protestantism you would have to exterminate Protestants. What is the *Watchman's* utterance but the old denial of a man's right to differ from the Church of Rome in matters of conscience, a denial which, in the days of her supremacy, found effective measures in the fire and sword? So long as there are people who believe that salvation is directly of Jesus Christ and not of Pope, the Virgin Mary and dead saints, and, in furtherance of this belief, advocate freedom of thought and speech, just so long will Protestantism flourish.

The Roman system never changes. The McGlynn trouble proves this. That man is too decidedly American in his sympathies and activities to suit the Roman authorities. It does not take a philosopher to see that the antipathy of those authorities to him is traceable to his pronounced opposition to the parochial school system and his advocacy of our public schools. Add to this his broad spirit of liberality, conceding the hope of salvation to Protestants, and affiliating with them, and his offence becomes intolerable.

(To be concluded in our next.)

JESUITISM.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP COXE, BUFFALO, N. Y.

At the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in Washington, December 7, 1887, Bishop Coxe of the Protestant Episcopal Church delivered an address, from which we quote the following :

JESUITISM is at war with governments, with Christian civilization ; and with it and the American Constitution there can be no compromise. Jesuitism is warfare that is not undisguised with all that is dear to most of the American people. The spirit of the American Constitution is found in our Naturalization Laws. Let me quote them, in brief, as follows:

"1. The alien seeking to be naturalized must make oath two years beforehand of his bona-fide intention to become a citizen of the United States, and to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty ; in particular that to which he has been subject.

"2. When he applies for naturalization after the two years thus provided for, he must prove that he has resided in the United States five years at least ; that during that time he has behaved as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution, and well-disposed to the good order and happiness of the same.

"3. If he has borne any hereditary title or been of any of the orders of nobility in the kingdom or state from which he came, he shall in addition to the above requisites make an express renunciation of his title or order of nobility.

"4. Finally, he shall at the time of his application make an oath that he will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounces and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, particularly the state or sovereignty of which he has been a subject."

In brief, then, our Constitution, as interpreted by legislation, asserts Home Rule for Americans. It assumes that no foreign potentate whatever shall be

permitted to dictate to us in matters of politics, of society, of legislation, of jurisprudence, of education, or of government in any of its forms. No American citizen shall be subject to any foreign court, so that he may be summoned to a foreign country to answer for his political conduct, or for anything affecting his rights as a citizen. Our country is competent to manage its own affairs; to settle the delicate relations between labor and capital and to regulate associations and organizations among the people, without inquiring of a foreign court, ignorant of our conditions, our wants and the spirit of our laws, what Americans may lawfully do. Take, for example, the case of a Roman Catholic citizen who happens to be an ecclesiastic and who assumes a political position which some regard as in conflict with his vocation; let his local superiors settle the ecclesiastical question here among themselves and give him just judgment, where, if they rob him of his profession and means of livelihood unjustly, they can be punished by the laws. As an American, he cannot lawfully be summoned beyond seas, to be judged by an Italian court. For look, if he can be thus dealt with for a wrong position, he may, also, be cited abroad and punished for a right one. If they may call him to account in Italy for his conduct in America when he votes for an agrarian, so, also, when it comes to sustaining our common school system, he may be cited to Rome and stripped

of his profession, because he votes to uphold and perpetuate it. If this can be done in one case, so in a thousand; and by terrorism, a thousand ecclesiastics may be forced to vote as an Italian dictates (an Antonelli perhaps, or another Borgia), and every such ecclesiastic will control a thousand lay voters by like terrorism. What then? The Government itself may be turned into a dependency of the Court of Rome. The balance of power may enable a minority to usurp the functions of government under color of law, and lo! we are transformed into a Mexico, with no choice but to bow our necks to a foreign domination, or to involve ourselves in religious wars for the preservation of freedom. See how wise are our laws in their unconscious Gallicanism; intolerant of all foreign interference, and, as I said, asserting Home Rule for Americans. We choose to be governed by ourselves, as were our Anglo-Saxon forefathers by themselves in the darkest days of papal domination. It was then that they said to the Italians: "*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.*" We say just as emphatically of our American laws and constitutions: We will not suffer them to be altered by any foreign dictation whatever.

But what is our actual concern with these principles just now? Are we threatened with alien interference and with a foreign power to influence and overawe our elections? I leave it to your own burning sense of recent events to frame the proper reply. The proposal to introduce a Papal nuncio into the republic; the residence among us of a Cardinal, who is a foreign prince and bound to a foreign court by obligations which no American has any right to assume; the goings to and fro

of ecclesiastics to consult an alien potentate as to our domestic questions of labor and labor associations and to prescribe to our citizens what they may do or not do in such issues; and the proposed establishment, in this Capital, of a university under the authority of a pontiff who, whatever the virtues of his private character, has been forced to reinvest the Jesuits with unlimited powers, and with functions against which every Roman Catholic government in Europe has protested not only in words, but by banishing the Jesuits as public enemies and confiscating their estates; I ask, are not these tokens of peril to be resisted here and now and for all time to come? Are they not the prelude to an open assault upon our common schools, and their subversion through political subservency?

Let me remind you of some tokens of alien warfare on our dearest relations in society, which we may rely on liberal Catholics to resist with us.

Archbishop Lynch, of Toronto, in a letter to Lord Randolph Churchill, reminds him that he and his confraternity hold the *balance of power* in Canada, and through it have controlled the elections there; and he goes on to assert that by a similar use of the *balance of power*, Presidential elections will be decided in this Republic.

In California, certain Roman Catholic dignitaries have insulted American social ties of the most sacred character, by reflecting on the marriages of the vast majority of our countrymen as mere concubinage.

Our school system is denounced in terms the most flagrant, and a counter-system is set up in which the un-American ideas of the Papal Syllabus are to

be imposed on thousands of our future voters. Private schools, if subjected to the supremacy of our laws, might receive the approval of Americans; but as Jesuit schools, they are a menace to the Republic. Take a fair example: I hold in my hand a book issued by the "Catholic Publication Society" in New York, to instruct children. Its motto is (quoted from Benedict XIV) "We affirm that the greatest part of the damned are in hell, because they did not know those mysteries of faith which Christians must know and believe." What are these mysteries? Let us read this authorized Roman Catholic school-book:

I quote (pp. 97-104) as follows:

"Q. Have Protestants any faith in Christ?

"A. They never had.

"Q. Why not?

"A. Because there never lived such a Christ as they imagine and believe in.

"Q. In what kind of a Christ do they believe?

"A. In such a one of whom they can make a liar, with impunity, whose doctrine they can interpret as they please, and who does not care what a man believes, provided he be an honest man before the public.

"Q. Will such a faith in such a Christ save Protestants?

"A. No sensible man will assert such an absurdity.

"Q. What will Christ say to them on the day of judgment?

"A. I know you not, because you never knew me.

"Q. Are Protestants willing to confess their sins to a Catholic bishop or priest, who alone has power from Christ to forgive sins? 'Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them.'

"A. No; for they generally have an utter aversion to confession, and therefore their sins will not be forgiven them throughout all eternity.

"Q. What follows from this?

"A. That they die in their sins and are

damned."

A Gallican would here remind his Jesuit brethren that even in the Roman Communion there was never any obligatory confession of this sort until the times (A.D. 1215) of Innocent III; and I ask liberal Roman Catholics whether they wish their children to be instructed in such Ultramontane ideas of their Protestant countrymen? Have we not a right to demand that the text-books and teachers of Roman Catholic schools, if chartered by our legislatures, be subject to Government inspection? If their proposed University in Washington receives a charter from the United States should it not contain such a prescription? Observe what sort of professors we shall have unless we protect ourselves like freemen. The book I have quoted is commended in unmeasured terms by a "professor of Moral Theology and Canon Law," who is a specimen of what such professors will be likely to teach, here, at our seat of government, and in constant intercourse with our law-givers, our judges, our Cabinet officers and the society of the White House itself.

"Professor Konings, C.S.F.R., speaking of the book which tells us that all Protestants will be damned, eulogizes it as follows:

"I have most carefully read and examined your excellent manuscript, 'Familiar Exposition of Christian Doctrine.' I took the liberty to make a few alterations. I do not hesitate for a moment to pronounce this work of yours one of the most useful for our time and country. It is written in the true spirit of St. Alphonsus. I was particularly pleased with those chapters which treat on the Church, Papal Infallibility, etc."

As he has "made a few alterations," we infer that he is the more responsible for all which remains unaltered.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

LETTER XV.

THE POPE OF ROME.

NEW YORK, January 12, 1888.

SIR:—At the opening of this new year, the first day of January, 1888, Vincent Joachim Pecci celebrated in St. Peter's Church, Rome, the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. For the last year he had been making arrangements for this celebration, had invited the whole Catholic world to rejoice with him, and to send him jubilee gifts. All the preparations were complete, and as events proved, the jubilations and especially the gifts were tremendous. Thirty thousand persons assembled within the walls of St. Peter's and pushed and crushed and crowded one another to get a glimpse of this old man as he was borne aloft on a high regal chair to the altar to offer up what is called "the sacrifice of the mass,"—that is, to bring the Lord Jesus Christ down from heaven and make him assume the form of a wafer which the people were told to worship as the only true and living God. They bowed before it and knelt before it as their God, but they bowed lower and prostrated themselves more abjectly before the old man who was the hero of the occasion, for he was the Pope of Rome.

Before no other man on earth who calls himself a Christian, that is, who believes on Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world, do people bow down in the temples of worship as those thirty thousand persons knelt before that old man in St. Peter's Church. Strange spectacle! Strange, but not new, for every reader of the Word of God is familiar with the prophetic teaching of the Apostle Paul in the second chapter of his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians:—

"We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? . . . And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."

That the prophetic warning of the Apostle has been understood as applying to the man who was borne aloft in the temple or church of St. Peter at Rome the other day, as if he were God, cannot be denied. Even the best Roman

Catholic commentators have to admit that the reference is to the Papacy. In the "note" on these verses in the Douay Bible it is said that the "falling away" was understood by the ancient fathers (who lived before there ever was a Pope), "as a revolt against the Roman empire. And it may perhaps be understood also as a revolt of many nations from the Catholic Church; which hath in part happened already by the means of Mahomet, Luther, etc., and as it may be supposed will be more general in the days of Antichrist; though even then the Catholic Church herself can never fall off from Christ." The last clause in that sentence is true, the Catholic Church never can fall away from Christ, because it is the universal church, but the Roman Church has fallen away, and by her new doctrines is getting further away from the teachings of Christ. The application to Mahomet is absurd, for he retained nothing of Christianity in his teachings and rejected Christ as the Son of God. The reference to Luther is supremely ridiculous, for he, instead of revolting against the Church of Christ or putting himself in the Saviour's place "to be worshipped as if he were God," lifted up Christ that all men might see the blessed Saviour and come to him with faith in his divine power to heal their sinful souls. Like the great Apostle of the Gentiles Luther exalted Christ as the Divine Being who came into this world of ours to save sinners, and for that purpose only. Luther knew the Scriptures and he preached from them, acknowledging himself a sinful man, without pomp or power or exaltation above his fellow men.

As to the "man of sin," the "note" in the Douay Bible says: "Here must be meant some particular man, the great Antichrist, who will come before the end of the world, but by no means refers to any Christian bishop; much less to a succession of bishops." The "fathers" who wrote these "notes" had a suspicion, which they could not hide, that the reference was to the "bishops of Rome." And their suspicion was well founded, for to no other men could it apply. The individual who presides over the Roman Catholic Church may not be the "particular man" whom the Douay Bible commentators refer to as the "man of sin," for some Popes have been men of godly lives; but the system of religion that takes the crown from the head of Jesus and places it on the head of Mary, is something else than the religion of Christ; and the Church in which that system is embodied while not directly opposed to Christ is a substitute for the true Church. The man who happens to be Pope at any particular period may be a true Christian, if he has faith and repentance, and places his trust for salvation in Jesus only. But through ignorance he may teach false doctrine and lead his followers away from the straight path that the Son of God has marked out for the salvation of all men.

It would extend this letter beyond readable bounds, Cardinal, to quote the opinions of godly men, wise and learned in the Scriptures, from the early Christian writers to our own day, who have spoken on this subject. I will quote only one, a man who occupies a position equal to that of any minister of Christ in any age, and whose learning, integrity and zeal command the respect of all men. I refer to the Rev. Dr. John Hall, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian

Church, New York. In a personal letter received from him a short time ago he says: "I see that in your magazine you are dealing with the controversy in which it seems to me great wisdom is needed. Too many declaim against Rome as *against* Christ (so they render 'Antichrist'), and seem to go too far and can be plausibly answered. Suppose Antichrist to mean (as the Greek *anti* often must mean,) *a substitute for Christ*, like him, professing friendship to him, but practically superseding him—the argument is intelligible and I think cogent. For the *one* Mediator Rome offers many; for the one sacrifice, many; for the Divine Teacher and Prophet, the infallible Pope; for the Spirit of God, the priestly virtue and the virtue of the sacraments, etc., etc. Probably you have thought this all out.

"Among the best, most scholarly works on the controversy I put 'The Catholic Layman,' issued in Dublin many years ago. Wylie on the Papacy I found good. Thompson's book on 'The Papacy and the Civil Power' is interesting as by an American Statesman."

The Pope's Jubilee celebration was a great event in the history of your Church, so great that it will be continued for several weeks. The second mass at St. Peter's was celebrated by the Pope on January 5. There were thirty thousand persons present, among them thirty-four cardinals and one hundred and eighty-nine archbishops and bishops. After mass the Pope, followed by all the Church dignitaries and invited guests in gorgeous court dress, proceeded to the sacristy where breakfast for seven hundred persons was prepared. He partook of breakfast, we are told, sitting alone at a small table raised above the others, but not separated from them. "Next to him sat the cardinals, and then the ladies of the Roman aristocracy. After breakfast all the nobility and high functionaries of the Papal court with the invited guests kissed the foot of his holiness."

Shall I quote more of the official report of the ceremony, or is that enough, Cardinal? I think it is enough and will dismiss the subject. I hope the good people who applied their lips to the Pope's toe found it kissable. You have kissed it more than once, but you will not tell us how you liked it. I never had that doubtful honor or questionable pleasure. But every one to their fancy, as the old Irishwoman said when she kissed her cow. I well remember the first time a pictorial representation of kissing the Pope's toe came before my vision. It was many years ago, in a small illustration in *Harper's Weekly*. There was only a great big toe and the thick lips of an Irishman affectionately kissing it. Not a word of explanation was offered—the picture spoke for itself. I was only a lad at the time, but in the intervening years I have never forgotten that picture. What effect it had on my destiny others may judge better than I can, but that picture often came before my mind during the years of my youth and through my priestly career, until I finally rejected and renounced the gross fanaticism and superstition of the Pope's Church.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

LETTER · XVI.

THE POPE IN POLITICS.

NEW YORK, January 14, 1888.

SIR:—At the regular weekly meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society in the Academy of Music, in this city, Sunday evening, January 8, Father Edward McGlynn delivered the following address. The great building was crowded in every part and hundreds who could not obtain even standing room were turned away from the doors. Nine-tenths of the audience were Irish Catholics who little more than a year ago were faithful children of the Church and devoted followers of the Pope. Thank God, they and other thousands like them are so no longer. Dr. McGlynn spoke for three hours on "The Pope in Politics," and how his remarks were greeted I leave the marks of applause in the report to tell. His first words were: "The Pope in Politics! What business has the Pope in politics, and what have politics to do with the Pope?" Then he continued:

We hear, during the first centuries of the Christian Church, of no concordats between the Pope and the emperor. (Applause, renewed several times). We hear of no ambassadors, official or semi-official, officious or unofficious, going to back doors or to kitchen stairways to negotiate understandings and compromises between the Pope and the civil power. (Applause). The word "Pope" had not yet come into existence. (Laughter). The development of the Papal power that has been going on for centuries was then undreamed of. You find little or nothing of it in the epistles of Peter, who ought to be as good a Pope, or almost as great a Pope, as his holiness, Leo XIII. (Great applause.) And you seek in vain in his epistles for anything like the incredible self-assertions of the last Pope, I should have said of the latest Pope. (Laughter and applause.) Men in their enthusiastic reverence for the Apostle never dreamed of carrying him upon their shoulders, but they carried him in their hearts. (Great applause.) And he never dreamed of attributing to himself, and no one else ever dreamed of attributing to him, all the wondrous conquests of the Christian Church during his not brief apostolate. There were other apostles, there were bishops and priests by the scores and the hundreds who did the work.

It is only the fashion of comparatively modern adulation and Pope-worship and Pope deification, to attribute to a poor old man already tottering on the brink of the grave, ignorant of the history and the geography of the world, all the triumphs of the Church of Christ. Christ gave to this man, Simon Bar Jona, the authority to be the shepherd over his flock, as he did to the other Apostles. Peter did not arrogate to himself the appointment of other Apostles. He, with the rest, permitted the choice of a new Apostle to take the place of the apostate and traitor, Judas, to depend upon the cast of a die or the drawing of lots. And

the successors of Peter for hundreds and hundreds of years, for very many hundreds of years, continued modest in their high office, eager everywhere to defend the purity of the faith, ready by their letters to rebuke any bishop, no matter how high placed, who should teach anything contrary to what had been taught by the Apostolic Church from the beginning. And he did not arrogate to himself the right to appoint bishops to rule, to domineer with minute inspection over the affairs of the clergy of the whole world. The bishops of the Church everywhere for a thousand years were elected by the clergy and the people, and they conquered the world—with the spirit of Christ and not with the sword of Peter.

After three centuries it unfortunately became good policy, as much as it was a matter of Christian conversion for the saving of his soul, or as it was said the result of a miraculous cross in the heavens, for Constantine the Emperor to become a Christian. And we, better than the Christians of the centuries that followed the time of Constantine, can see what a sad mistake it was, what a pitiable and unfortunate thing it was, that the Church of Christ was befriended, protected, enriched, not merely with wealth, but with temporal power, by Constantine and his successors. Thence dates the beginning of the degeneration of the Christian Church. The purple that symbolized, not the blood with which Christ empurpled his cross, but the power that Constantine gave to the Church, is the imperial purple. The privilege of wearing it comes from Constantine and his successors.

The very virtues of the Church unfortunately gave occasion to the wealth and the power that have corrupted it. Christians were willing or even eager to bring their disputes about temporal matters to the arbitration of the bishop, who was their father and their friend. In his wisdom and impartiality they had implicit confidence. In an evil hour the emperor gave the sanction of law to the judgments of bishops and erected episcopal tribunals. Great princes, wealthy testators, emperors, lavished boundless wealth upon the Church, that the Church might be their almoner in doing works of religion, of education and of charity. It is a thousand pities that the Church accepted so perilous a trust. (Applause.)

Let us, taught by the bitter example of a thousand years of shameful history, do what we can by voice and pen and labor to prevent the repetition of the blunder, that shall not be merely a blunder but a crime if it be repeated at all in this new virgin continent, of that union of Church and State, which means the injury and the corruption of both.

The Roman Empire, in spite of its conversion to Christianity, was doomed by its crimes, by its false policies, by its absolutism, which Christianity taught it little or nothing to mitigate. The Christian Church came to teach certain general principles of religion and of morality; but somehow or other it was left to men, by sad and painful experience, by the oppressions and the robberies, the wars and the murders of long centuries, to find out for themselves the beauty of universal suffrage, the beauty of republicanism; to discover for themselves the rights of man, the rights of citizenship; to discover, or rather to re-discover and to re-promulgate the magnificent teaching of our Declaration of Independence, of the equality of men and of the inalienable rights of men to life, liberty, and

the pursuit of happiness. (Applause.) I know that these things are all contained in germ in the Gospel, in the parables of Christ, in the teaching of the Christian Church; and yet, somehow or other, they failed for all these centuries to find their perfect application.

And we must say apologetically that it was not the business of the Church to teach either monarchy or republicanism. It was the business of the Christian Church to teach certain religious truths, to preach pure morals, to stand for the supremacy of the moral order in the world, to give to poor, weak, sinful man spiritual help and medicine. But it has been true and it shall be ever true of political questions, as it is true of scientific questions, what the Scripture says of the universe: "He has delivered it over to the disputations of man." (Applause.) It was not, then—and we need not blame the Papacy—it was not the fault of the Church if it did not teach the Roman Empire republicanism.

The Roman Empire became speedily Christian in its highest places, and the Roman Emperors were glad to conciliate the Christian Church. They were glad to lavish power and wealth upon the Church, not merely that it might be the almoner and educator, but that it might also be in great measure the special policeman, well paid, to keep down the mob. (Applause.)

And because of its crimes the Roman Empire fell. It richly deserved to fall. And the Christian society, in spite of not a few of the blunders and crimes that it began to contract because of its alliance with that Roman Empire, must still remain, in spite of its human advocates, as a witness of Christ's truth, as the minister of his sacraments, as a teacher of morals to those who would practice even while the preacher did not practice himself. The Roman Empire was broken into many fragments by sturdy barbarians from the north, men full of martial vigor, men with many natural virtues but still barbarians and savage. They were able to destroy the Roman Empire but they were not able to destroy the Christian Church, for that, in spite of its human side, had within it a divine element. It still stood for Christ. And so the barbarian fell on his knees before the Christian altar and eagerly craved Christian baptism and Christian doctrine and Christian sacraments and Christian morals. And when the barbarians became Christians, full of gratitude to the Church that had rescued them from savagery, that had taught them to read, that had given them gentle manners and arts, they lavished everything at the feet of the mother who taught them, who nursed them, as it were, into spiritual life.

And here was the second blunder. A thousand pities that the Church accepted the trust, accepted the lands, accepted the gifts of the newly converted nations, allowing her councils in great measure to be so mixed up with the civil parliaments of these new founded nations that it was hard to say where the council ended and the parliament began, or where the parliament ended and the council began. Bishops, noblemen and sovereigns were all mingled in one common council, Church and State in almost inextricable confusion. It seemed good, it seemed a wise, an admirable thing that there should be such an excellent understanding between the spiritual and the temporal power. But the

clear, cold light of history makes plain that it was a horrible blunder. And for us to repeat the blunder would be the most unpardonable of crimes. (Applause.)

You owe to that condition of things all the squabbles and the conflicts and the interminable wars between Church and State, continued for hundreds of years during the dark ages. You owe to this the temporal power of the Pope. You owe to this the Pope's assumed right to restore the Roman Empire in the person of Charlemagne. You owe to this the principle of the Pope to control the empire of Germany, to crown the Emperor of Germany and to call him the sovereign of the holy Roman Empire, of which Voltaire not only truly, but wittily, said that it was called holy Roman Empire because it was neither holy nor Roman. It was not Roman, but German, and it was decidedly unholy.

And from this union of Church and State that rose from the gratitude of the newly converted people lavishing everything at the feet of the Church, came the indescribable corruption, the degenerate ignorance, the degradation of morals both in the clergy and the laity, the interminable confusion of the middle ages. And it was that condition of things, that need of reformation, a need that still continued for centuries in spite of the cry that was going up from thousands of the faithful for reformation of the Church both in its head and in its members, it was that condition of things that continued so long in spite of the prayers of so many saints and sages, in spite of the sincere conviction and the earnest desire of all men everywhere, it was the continuation of that influence that made necessary the Protestant Reformation. (Applause.)

It is not my business here to-night, dear friends, to justify the destruction of any of the good things that that Protestant Reformation destroyed. But the Protestant Reformation became, as it were, a necessity, a matter of course to be delayed no longer, and to be foreseen by an intelligent, sagacious spirit, as are the physical tempests that, no matter how much they may destroy, are yet absolutely indispensable to the general equilibrium of nature. After a protracted heated term of many days in hot climates, it becomes absolutely necessary that there shall be tempests, storms, thunder and lightning, hurricanes, tornadoes. I know that the tornado or hurricane is no respecter of persons or institutions. I know that the thunderbolt of heaven may rive the steeple of God's church as well as destroy a building dedicated to unworthy or unholy uses.

And so it may be with great political, great social revolutions. They may do much harm. They may do great wrong in the effort to effect radical remedy. They may tear up by the roots most precious things without which we should fare but ill. And yet that storm, that tempest, that hurricane, becomes, as it were, a necessity because of the criminal stupidity, the carelessness, the heartlessness, the mercilessness, with which those in authority, whether in church or state, repel as rebellious the cry that goes up from thousands of places all over the world, the cry begging for justice, for truth, for mercy, for reformation. (Applause.)

During the middle ages the Papacy grew to be a sort of universal sovereignty, largely built up by the wish of the peoples themselves in their gratitude to

the Church that done so much for them. But in spite of all that, we must say that it was a great misfortune that the Church enjoyed such power. The Church would have been wiser if she had as speedily as possible taught the children she had converted to go out and prove themselves, if she had spurned the kingly office that was offered to her. Even though the crown should have thrice been offered to her she should have thrice refused it. It is a thousand pities that the Church forgot the spirit of her Master in not repeating in all the ages, "My kingdom is not of this world." (Applause.)

They justify the union of Church and State as necessary for the liberty of the Church. To that we may say that the best union of Church and State does exist to a great extent here because of the admirable liberty that is given to all churches to do as they please, to teach as they please, provided their teachings do not conflict with public morality. Here, then, I say, we need no better union of Church and State than we have. And what we call separation of Church and State is the best union, where the Church will respect the rights of the country and the country will respect the liberty of all churches to teach their creeds. (Applause.)

The temporal power, the wealth lavished upon the Church, became a most fruitful source of corruption of popes, and cardinals, and prelates, and priests. The Pope to a great extent became a temporal ruler, enriching his family, providing husbands for his neices and wives for his nephews. (Laughter.) It is largely to the papal court and to ecclesiastical courts, to popes and cardinals and bishops, that we owe that odious word with which the dictionary of all European languages has unfortunately been enriched—the word "nepotism." The Pope as a temporal ruler making treaties with France against Spain and treaties with Spain against France, forming alliances with foreign powers against Italian principalities, and then allying himself with the Italian principalities against these foreign powers. And thus Catholic countries have had to look upon him time and again as a foreign enemy, and while calling him holy father they hire men and send them out to shoot this holy father. (Laughter and applause.)

This went so far that Pope Alexander VI of infamous memory—his holiness, Pope Alexander VI, well known as Roderick Borgia—had his illegitimate children occupying his many palaces. And Caesar Borgia, a great swash-buckler, a bully, a brute, a desperado and adventurer, in the name of and by the authority of his father, his holiness, Alexander VI, was actually travelling up and down the unfortunate Italian states killing and robbing and murdering in the name of his father, the holy father, the Pope. And Lucretia Borgia, well known upon these theatrical boards, was another one of the beautiful children of his holiness, Alexander VI. And it is significant that at the time that his holiness, Alexander VI, ruled the Roman Church, a chubby, flaxen haired little German boy was playing round the streets of a town in Saxony, a boy whose name was Martin Luther. (Applause.)

And after Alexander VI there was a Pope Julius II. He did not lavish honors upon any son of his, if he had one, but he actually went on horseback to

conquer the rebellious city of Bologna. And he had a cast made of himself in metal, sword in hand, and this in the name of him who said: "My kingdom is not of this world." (Applause.)

All through the middle ages the Pope assumed as much as he could of power, temporal as well as spiritual. And he asserted his right to interfere with the feuds of princes, protesting that he did not judge concerning the fief that was in question, but concerning the sin. And, on that pretense, there is nothing in human life in which priest, pope or bishop could not interfere.

It is the teaching of Christian theology that it is not in the power of councils or popes, or council and pope together, or the whole Catholic episcopacy called together, to teach any new doctrine as a doctrine of the Christian faith. If it is a new doctrine, then it cannot be a doctrine of the Christian faith. Now my friends, that immediately brushes away ninety-nine one-hundredths of all this rubbish that we hear about every day, that we heard last Sunday or read in the newspapers next day, that everything that the Pope utters is an oracle of God. A man in this very city dared from a Catholic pulpit to preach such rubbish as that last Sunday. (Hisses and cries of "Preston.") He said substantially that every word of the "holy father" was the utterance of the Holy Ghost. Now, is not that most monstrous? Will the world ever accept such "rot" as that? (Cries of "No! no!" and applause.) Does it not make the cheeks of you Catholics tingle and burn with shame? (Cries of "Yes! yes!")

So far is it from being true that the Pope's every word is the oracle of the Holy Ghost that it is the explicit teaching of Catholic theology that the Pope may utter blunders, not merely in private conversation, but that he may go into the pulpit of St. Peter's Church—next door to his "prison,"—and from the pulpit of that church preach a sermon full of heresies.

The Pope as a preacher in St. Peter's Church, or any other church, teaching a single congregation, may be so ignorant of his theology and the definitions of the Church as to teach heresy upon heresy, and thus make a fool of himself. No importance is to be attached to this New York priest (Preston) who says that every word the Pope utters is the voice of the Holy Ghost. These flatterers of the Pope are making of him a kind of divinity that the world must reject with loathing and indignation. (Applause.) "All you subjects of the Pope are bound to obey him." Are we? Has he a right to send a telegram to one of us saying, "Come over here to Rome; I want to talk to you about something. I shall not exactly tell you what, nor say how long I shall keep you here." And in the good old times he might have stuck you into jail and kept you there for life by virtue of his kingly power as the temporal as well as the spiritual ruler of Rome. Has he a right to do that? I say, no. (Cries of "No! no!" and applause.) This power is necessarily limited by the very nature of the case that every man's conscience is the final arbiter for him how far he is bound to obey the Pope or any one else. (Great applause.)

You will have the conclusion of this fine address next month, Cardinal.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

The number of new subscribers sent us by friends this year is larger than ever. From Kingston, Canada, comes twenty-four, from two towns in Pennsylvania noble lists of twenty-seven and twenty-five, from New England several large lists, from Iowa large lists, and so on. This is very encouraging, and we heartily thank our friends who strengthen our hands in this manner. We are sorry to say that the hundreds of our subscribers who have neglected to renew their subscriptions more than counterbalance the list of new friends. But we hope this will not continue, and that all will renew without further delay.

Valuable and Reliable.

As evidence of the value and reliability of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, the following will be read with interest:

DOVER, N. J., Jan. 13th, '88.

MY DEAR FRIEND AND BROTHER:

I learn from Rev. Fred, Bloom, (Dover, N. J.), one of the Post-Graduate Class of Drew Seminary, that Prof. Crooks, D. D., stated to the class, about a fortnight since, that he had become a constant reader of your CONVERTED CATHOLIC, and had found it of such value both for interesting subject matter and reliability, that he intended to procure the bound volumes as an excellent work of reference on the subject it claims to discuss.

He also recommended it to the students of his class as a valuable assistant in their present course of study, *i.e.* "The History of the Creeds of Christendom," which includes the controversy between Gladstone and Monsig. Capel on the "Pope and the Vatican."

Learning these facts I thought it but

right that I should acquaint you with them.

Yours in the bonds of an aggressive Gospel,
REV. J. S. BRADBROOK.

...

Ten Copies for Five Dollars.

THE head of a firm in Marshalltown, Iowa, doing the largest business of its kind in that beautiful town, sends us the following letter, dated Dec. 31, 1887:

DEAR SIR.—I wish you a happy and prosperous New Year, and trust you may see increasing good results from your work. I have no doubt about the fruits of your labors whether you are spared to see them or not. The General Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. says your CONVERTED CATHOLIC is much liked and read by a great many persons. I enclose draft for five dollars.

Very truly yours, B. B.

For that sum we will send ten copies of the magazine to different Associations. There are over 300 Associations in the United States largely frequented by Catholics, and we want to reach them all. Who will help us to do so?

...

A Most Useful Tract.

61 EAST ELEVENTH ST., NEW YORK,
January 16, 1888.

I was in the rooms of the N. Y. Sunday School Association a few days ago when a lady came in and asked for your tract, "The Portrait of Mary in Heaven," saying that she knew a person who had intended to become a Roman Catholic but was deterred by its perusal, and she desired more copies.

I was glad to be able to direct her to your office where she could find the tract. I am also glad to give you this encouragement in your work, that is so important, and that I pray may be blessed and widely extended.

C. M. G.